

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Bradley	Grassley	Nunn
Breaux	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchison	Roth
Coats	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cohen	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simon
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Simpson
Craig	Kennedy	Smith
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Exon	Lieberman	
Faircloth	Lott	

NAYS—1

Johnston

NOT VOTING—2

Moynihan

Warner

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, that will give everybody interested in the product liability bill an opportunity to discuss what their remaining strategy or plans may be. We would like to complete action on the bill today. And then, if possible, we would like to move to the trash bill sometime this afternoon and try to complete action on that bill this week.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the evidence of support to extend an invitation to President Lee Teng-hui to visit the United States in an unofficial capacity. I think the support, as evidenced by the vote of 97 to 1 is a clear message of the prevailing attitude in this body toward extending this invitation.

It is my hope that the administration and the State Department will understand the intensity of the feelings with regard to our friends in Taiwan as evidenced in President Lee visiting his alma mater and to a send him to the United States-Republic of China Economic Council Conference in September of this year. I thank my colleagues for their assistance, understanding, and support of this resolution.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GORTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 768 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Delaware.

(The remarks of Mr. ROTH and Mr. D'AMATO pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 117 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S SUMMIT IN MOSCOW

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today the President of the United States is participating in Russia's May 9 commemoration of V-E Day. President Clinton accepted Russian President Boris Yeltsin's invitation to this event despite the fact that I and many of my colleagues encouraged him to select another time for a United States-Russian summit. We were concerned that because of the moral ambiguity of this commemoration, United States participation would undermine the relationship we seek to develop with Russia. We must not forget that the Soviet Union contributed to the outbreak of World War II, exploited the war's end, and committed countless atrocities to Russians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and other peoples subject to its brutal domination.

President Clinton should not have accepted this invitation, but now that he has, it is for these reasons that during his visit to Moscow he must meet not only with Russia's leaders, but the Russian people and emphasize three key themes. First, he must emphasize human rights. Second, democracy. And, third, rejection of empire. In doing so, the President would encourage all Russians not to look nostalgically back on the Soviet Union, but forward toward the potential of a democratic and postimperial Russia.

That should be the principal purpose of President Clinton's visit.

Toward this end, President Clinton must emphasize that his role in this celebration is not to honor the Soviet Union, but the valor and sacrifices of all the peoples who fought in opposition against Nazi aggression.

He must underscore the fact that while the United States, as a whole, celebrates victory in this war, it has not forgotten the victims nor any crimes committed during that era, be it by the Nazis, Stalin and his henchmen, or others.

This will not slight those who fought valiantly against fascism, as indeed did millions of Russians. It will in fact honor them even more highly by ensuring that their contributions are distinguished from the war-mongering and atrocities of that brutal time. And, in this way, the President will clearly differentiate the United States from those who seek to reanimate the Soviet past.

In articulating these themes, the President must publicly and forcefully address the ongoing war in Chechnya. Moscow's management of the Chechnyan autonomy movement is depressingly reminiscent of the policies that Stalin, himself, used to terrorize the peoples incorporated into the former Soviet Union. It indicates the fragility of democracy in Russia and, perhaps, even a weakening of its impulse.

President Clinton vowed that he would not visit Russia as long as Moscow continues the war against Chechnya. Indeed, Mr. President, in the weeks preceding this summit meeting, President Yeltsin actually stepped up military operations against the Republic, leveling more towns and killing more innocent civilians, both Russian and Chechnyan.

It is therefore absolutely essential that President Clinton speak forthrightly to the Russian people, not hiding the fact that America condemns the brutal use of military force against Chechnya.

He should state that America's relationship with Russia is contingent upon Moscow's peaceful resolution of its differences with the Chechnyan people. Hesitation on this matter will undermine the legitimacy of Russia's true democrats who have valiantly protested against this war and will strip credibility from our efforts to support Russia's still embryonic democracy.

The bottomline, Mr. President, is that human rights is an international issue. If Russia avows to be a member of the community of democracies founded upon respect for inalienable human rights, it must live up to those standards.

Third, in order for a true strategic partnership to evolve between the United States and Russia, Moscow must respect the sovereignty of the non-Russian nations of the former Soviet Union and former Warsaw Pact.

In this regard, the President's decision to visit Ukraine is crucially important. A Kyiv summit will be an important signal of America's commitment to assist the consolidation of Ukraine's independence. In light of Ukraine's intertwined history with Russia, the success of Ukrainian independence and integration into the Western community of nations will be a critical determinant of Russia's evolution into a postimperial state.

An important underpinning of the constructive role we desire Russian-Ukrainian relations to play in European security has been the Tripartite Agreement between Russia, Ukraine, and the United States. In addition to facilitating the elimination of Ukraine's nuclear arsenal, the agreement committed Russia to respect Ukraine's sovereignty and independence. While in Moscow President Clinton must underscore America's commitment to this agreement and our expectations that Russia do the same.

The President must also emphasize that NATO enlargement will contribute to greater peace and stability in post-cold war Europe. He must communicate that this is a normal process that is driven not only by the need to address the security of Central Europe but also by the Central Europeans who have clearly articulated their desire for membership.

By further ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe, NATO expansion will positively and significantly shape the futures of Russia and Germany, two great powers now engaged in a delicate and complex process of national redefinition. It is a critical step toward providing the security essential to enhance the prosperity and stability now beginning to characterize Central and Eastern Europe.

It is a requirement for preserving Germany's progressive role in European affairs and promoting Russia's postimperial evolution. By creating greater stability along Russia's frontiers, NATO enlargement would allow Moscow to spend more of its energy on the internal challenges of political and economic reform.

I hope that, while he is in Moscow, our President will underscore the fact that Russia cannot and will not have any veto over the future membership of NATO.

We all must recognize that NATO enlargement is a process whose outcome Russia will, nonetheless, inevitably influence. If Russia resists the process through intimidation or aggression, NATO enlargement will more likely be directed against Russia. If Russia respects the rights of other nations to determine their own geopolitical orientation, if Russia recognizes the objective benefits of NATO enlargement, and if Russia ultimately works with the alliance, enlargement will contribute to a broader engagement and integration that will bring Europe and Russia closer together.

As it was well put in one of the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on this matter, it is not NATO enlargement that will determine the future of Russia's relationship with the alliance, but Moscow's reaction to NATO enlargement.

Finally, during his stay in Moscow President Clinton must emphasize that America is more interested in the future of Russian democracy than in the fate of a single leader. I strongly encourage that the President meet with members of Russia's beleaguered press and those democratically minded legislators—particularly Sergei Kovalyov, the Duma's former Human Rights Commissioner who was recently relieved of his duties because of his courageous criticism of the Russian Government's Chechnya policy. Perhaps, the President should even meet with those Russian generals who oppose this war, such as former Deputy Minister of Defense Boris Gromov who also lost his position for his criticism.

I say this because the future of our relationship with Russia lies not with those who fall back on the brutal mechanisms of a bygone age, but with those who envision Russia as a prospering democracy.

Mr. President, America's role in Moscow's V-E Day celebrations should be to encourage Russian people and their leaders to concentrate not on the former Soviet Union, but on Russia's future. These themes—human rights, democracy, and the rejection of empire—are the keys not only to unlocking Russia's potential but also to a true strategic partnership between Russia and the United States. Should Moscow's leaders respond positively to these themes, it would be a strong demonstration that Russia is shedding the imperialist ambitions and totalitarian proclivities of the Soviet past.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### HEARINGS SCHEDULED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment briefly on a series of hearings scheduled by the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information of the Judiciary Committee in the wake of Oklahoma City, although one had actually been scheduled in advance.

We have so far had hearings on the statutes proposed by the administration and others. We have had a hearing in response to certain groups concerned with the issue of constitutional rights. A hearing is scheduled for this Thursday, May 11, on the so-called mayhem manuals, where you can find out how to make a bomb, and a hearing is scheduled on May 18 on the incidents involving Waco, TX and Ruby Ridge, ID.

I have received correspondence from the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Senator HATCH, who raises a question about the timeliness of the hearings and about the jurisdiction of my subcommittee. I have responded to Senator HATCH, and intend to put the correspondence in the RECORD so it may be available for the public, by noting that the jurisdiction is clear-cut on the subcommittee, both under the authority on terrorism and on governmental information.

It is my view, Mr. President, that it is important and the hearings are long past due on what happened at Waco, TX and what happened at Ruby Ridge, ID. There can be no misunderstanding or no question that whatever happened at Waco, TX and Ruby Ridge, ID, that there is absolutely, positively no justification for the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City, OK.

But there has been a great deal of concern about whether there has been a candid response by the Government of the United States, and in the congressional oversight responsibility, we should lay all the facts on the table in the interest of full disclosure—let the chips fall where they may. The virtue of strength of a democracy is that we do not cover our mistakes; that if there are errors and if there are problems, we identify them forthrightly.

There had been some concern that a hearing on Ruby Ridge, ID might in some way prejudice the investigation by the prosecuting attorney who may intend to bring some charges, perhaps even against Federal officials. I have had an extended discussion with Randolph Day, Esq., the county attorney for Boundary County, who has advised me that he sees no problem in our going forward with hearings by the subcommittee.

A number of Senators have made public statements about the importance of having such hearings. Others of my colleagues have discussed the matters with me privately. I do think it is important that hearings proceed and that other Senators and the public be aware of the status of this matter.

So I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from Senator HATCH to me dated May 8, with my reply to him dated May 9, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, May 8, 1995.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR ARLEN: I am writing with regard to your public statements concerning the convening of a hearing in the Terrorism, Technology and Government Information subcommittee to review the incidents at Waco, Texas and Ruby Ridge, Idaho. This letter is intended to settle any misunderstanding that may exist as to what the Senate Judiciary Committee's plans are surrounding a review of these matters.